

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1633

There is one phrase in the amendment which intrigues me. I refer to the words: "who personally casts his vote."

I wonder whether the gentleman from Texas intends in any way to interfere with absentee voting.

Mr. DOWDY. Certainly not. An absentee ballot would be personally cast. It would be a live vote.

Mr. WESTLAND. A what?

Mr. DOWDY. A live vote. It would not be cast by a dead person.

Mr. WESTLAND. I understand that. I am not in favor of having any dead people vote.

Mr. DOWDY. I should like to have it understood that my amendment is non-discriminatory in nature. It would apply to dead white folks as well as to dead colored folks.

Mr. WESTLAND. That is fine, but I should like to get on the Record that this would in no way interfere with the absentee balloting.

Mr. DOWDY. No. I stated that as a preface to my remarks when I offered my amendment.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy] a question. I am certainly sympathetic with every attempt to do away with tombstone voting. However, I think there is one element here in this amendment that has not been brought out yet. Let me put this situation to you. In Michigan, under our State constitution, a registered eligible voter in Michigan can move out of Michigan down to the gentleman's State, Texas. Within the period of time during which the person who has moved cannot establish residence in Texas for the purposes of voting, nevertheless under the Michigan constitution that voter, who is no longer a resident of Michigan, you understand, because he has moved to Texas, is permitted to cast a vote in Michigan for presidential electors or for President and Vice President. Now, he is no longer a resident in the precinct in which the vote was cast. Would this provision not supersede the constitutional provision of the State of Michigan?

Mr. DOWDY. No I think not. I think not. He would be under a laws a legal resident for voting purposes of the precinct.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. The gentleman will notice his residence is not within the voting precinct, and those are the words of your amendment.

Mr. DOWDY. But under your laws you say he is still considered an eligible voter and his residence is still Michigan for the period of time, whatever you provide. It would not be my intention to override any State law in respect to voting residence.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Then we have a legislative history on this point.

Mr. DOWDY. That is right.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak, but lest there be any danger that Members vote for this amendment thinking there will be some improvement

in vote frauds in the United States, a word of warning is necessary. What the bill before us proposes to do in respect of voting rights is to involve the Federal Government in an area where there has been a clear demonstration that States and localities have not been able to do right by a certain segment of the population. And we do so reluctantly. In fact, with great restraint. As it has been pointed out, we refused to go into the question of State elections even though there is power under the Constitution for the Congress to do so.

The gentleman from Texas proposes an amendment that is going to put the Federal Government and the Federal courts in a great many areas where your Committee on the Judiciary has not intended it go. You will make the Federal courts the judge of every aspect of voting qualification—residence, age, not incarcerated, and more of them having anything to do with race, religion or national origin. We think that these matters are properly left to State courts. We do not think that the Federal Government and Federal courts should involve themselves. The Federal Government and Federal courts are involved in those areas where the right to vote in Federal elections is denied because of race, religion, or national origin. We do not propose to go beyond that in this bill.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. I have the highest esteem for the gentleman, but I never thought I would hear him make a speech for States rights. I want to thank him for that. My question is this. I thought maybe we could reach some area of agreement on this. Perhaps no vote shall be cast for a dead person after two elections have transpired.

Mr. LINDSAY. Is the gentleman proposing an amendment to his amendment? If the gentleman will offer an amendment to his amendment, the members of the committee will consider it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Is not the real danger here that this amendment will have the effect of subverting and changing quite a number of State statutes?

Mr. LINDSAY. Possibly.

Mr. CELLER. And is it not also true that if the words used "personal voting" were changed and could be maintained, if we adopted this amendment, it might have the serious effect of interfering with absentee voter ballots in a number of States?

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes, it might. Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude by saying that I supported my friend from Florida on the question of the Civil Rights Commission's authority to examine the matter of having votes counted. Even that is limited and subject to the problem of racial discrimination. But this pending amendment is quite different. The Civil Rights Commission reports to the President and to

the Congress as to the state of the facts on certain matters involving civil rights. That is something quite different from writing into Federal law at this moment a new provision with respect to qualifications of voters in the States.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course, I yield.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, on re-examining my amendment I find I used "neither/nor" and it should be "either/or." I ask unanimous consent that that correction be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have waited 3½ years to make these remarks and I do not want to be denied the privilege. I recognize that we are at the spoofing stage of this afternoon's session. I will not protract that. I would like to mention to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], that it was down in his district in Florida 3½ years ago, immediately after the November 1960, election, that I heard the most eloquent and most indignant States rights "Keep the Snooping Federals Out," speech I ever heard anywhere. The remarks were not made by any gentleman from Florida or any other southerner. They were made over television. They were made because of the proposal of a distinguished Member of the other body, who happened at that time to be the Republican national chairman, asking for a Federal investigation of alleged voting frauds in the Presidential election; the voting of gravestones, and the failure to count votes in a certain major metropolitan area. The great States rights speech was made by the very distinguished mayor of the city of Chicago, Mayor Daley. So I guess it is just a question of whose ox is gored.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dowdy].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Dowdy) there were—ayes 98, noes 109.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Dowdy and Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 124.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7152) to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive re-

lief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

STATES GRAB GAMBLING REVENUES

(Mr. FINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, many years ago horseracing was considered the sport of kings not because it provided excitement and pleasure but because it helped to breed better horses.

But, that was a long, long time ago. Today, horseracing is no longer the sport of kings but rather the sport of governors. Horseracing is no longer used to test and breed better horses but to fatten depleted State treasuries. Horseracing, today, is no longer a sport but big business.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, more and more legalization of parimutuel betting in order to capitalize on the instinctive gambling spirit of the American people. As a matter of fact, in the past year, the States of Vermont and Nevada have joined the other 24 parimutuel betting States in order to participate in this lucrative gambling business which has grown into a \$4 billion a year industry.

We have also seen Mr. Speaker, State after State lengthening its racing seasons not so much for the amusement of the attendance at the racetracks which last year was over \$4 million, certainly not to breed finer horses, but to pump more of this gambling revenue into the coffers of the government treasuries.

A classic example is my own State of New York which expects to again increase its racing season an additional 10 days in order to grab another \$5 million in parimutuel taxes. It has already been estimated that New York's share of parimutuel betting revenue for this year will reach the sum of \$125 million. Not bad.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, points to the hypocrisy that exists in this country. We practice one thing and preach another. We maintain a pious and sanctimonious attitude about gambling but become active partners in all of the gambling action at the racetracks. The U.S. Treasury has been and continues to be the glad recipient of millions of dollars a year in admission taxes collected from over 54 million persons whose thirst to gamble brings them through the racetrack turnstiles. We preach the evils of gambling but, yet, in 1951 we recognized and sanctioned gambling in the United States by imposing a 10 percent tax and the requirement of a \$50 tax stamp on all gamblers in this country.

The 26 States which have legalized betting on horses, have proven one

thing: that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings and that a tax on this gambling activity can and does produce great incomes which are essential to balancing government budgets.

Mr. Speaker, if the Members of this Congress would only remove the blinders, they would see that gambling in the United States is a \$100 billion a year tax-free monopoly. If they would only open their eyes and accept the fact that millions of our citizens enjoy the relaxation and pleasures of gambling, we can pump over \$10 billion a year in additional revenue into our treasury through a Government-run lottery.

Legalization of a national lottery in this country would not only satisfy this human thirst to gamble—would not only meet the approval of the people who favor a Government lottery 9 to 1 but would provide the additional income to cut burdensome taxes and reduce our national debt.

When are we going to get smart? *per*

POTENTIAL SECURITY RISKS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. STINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, many people in the United States have been wondering why our foreign relations have been going so badly for us for the past several years. Perhaps the attached newspaper article provides some explanation.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Feb. 1, 1964]

SECRET LIST NAMES 800 AS POSSIBLE RISKS

A list of potential security risks in the State Department, kept secret since it was prepared in 1956 by a now-deceased departmental security chief, has been turned up by congressional investigators.

Dated June 27, 1956, and signed by Scott McLeod, administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the Eisenhower administration, the memorandum states:

"On the Department rolls are some 800 individuals concerning whom the Office of Security has information which raises questions in major or minor degree with respect to the criteria of Executive Order 10450, namely questions as to possible past Communist activity or associations, false statements, immoral conduct, homosexuality, intoxication, mental defects, etc. All have been cleared as qualified for access to classified information.

250 CASES CALLED SERIOUS

"Of the 800-odd listed, there are approximately 250 on whom the questions are, in my opinion, serious in relation to the broad security responsibilities of the Department. Sixty percent are incumbents in high level assignments in the Department or in the field.

"About one-half are assigned to what can be categorized as critical intelligence slots in the Department or to top level boards and committees.

"The situation described is obviously serious and deserves urgent attention."

In an attempt to find out what action was taken on the list and how many of the employees were cleared and are still in the Department, the Senate Internal Security Sub-

committee met in closed session this week with an official of the State Department.

DEPARTMENT IS CONCERNED

The witness, according to congressional sources, provided no information but is to be questioned again after he has consulted with top State Department officials.

It was understood, however, that officials in the State Department were deeply concerned about the appearance of the list in the hands of the committee.

Mr. McLeod left the security post in 1957. He was named U.S. Ambassador to Ireland, and remained on oversea assignment until the Democratic administration came to power. He died in 1961.

The last of the security officials in the Department from the McLeod regime was Otto F. Otepka, who is now fighting dismissal charges filed against him by the Department.

SOVIET MURDER OF THREE U.S. AIR FORCE FLIERS

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, apparently our give-up-easy State Department has closed its file on the Soviet murder of three U.S. Air Force fliers in the unarmed jet trainer plane over East Germany last week.

An Associated Press news report in yesterday's Washington Star opens with this statement:

U.S. officials say they consider the shooting down of an American jet trainer plane over East Germany to be a closed incident so far as its effect on larger East-West policy issues is concerned.

This shameful decision—if in fact it is the official decision—is rendered doubly shameful by its apparent anonymity.

I challenge the State Department to identify the unnamed U.S. officials who reportedly have decided to sweep the matter under the rug.

I challenge the Secretary of State to inform the American people whether he, personally, is a party to or supports this disgraceful decision.

The Associated Press report contains this further statement:

The judgment of the U.S. policymakers is that there was no excuse for the Russians to shoot down the plane and that their efforts should have been continued to force it to land safely or to turn it back.

However, since the Russians have returned the bodies of the airmen as well as the wrecked aircraft, the view of officials now is that no worthwhile purpose can be served by continuing to make an issue of what they consider an extremely unfortunate, but closed incident.

The American people—and the nearest of kin of the Air Force officers thus brutally murdered—are entitled to clear and categorical answers to these questions:

First. Who precisely are the "policy-makers" who have decided that this is a "closed incident"?

Second. The Associated Press report states that two U.S. fighters were sent up to intercept the trainer when it was found impossible to communicate with its crew. It states that "these planes were unable to reach the trainer before